

Appin No. 09/375,122
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Response to Office action of July 01, 2004

6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated July 1, 2004. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant files the following submission.

Pages 1 and 2 of the specification have been amended to update the list of co-pending applications with USPTO application serial numbers and granted patent numbers.

Claims Rejections

In Item 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has listed a number of clarity problems with various claims. In response we have introduced the following claim amendments:

Claim 1 has been amended to refer to "two of said four pixels in each block" and "the other two of said four pixels". All references to "ordinate" have been substituted with "coordinate", which is the proper term for a positional reference with regard to any of the three space dimensions. Finally the expression "mapped pixels" has been amended to "all mapped pixels" in order to emphasize the fact that it refers to the pixels of both dominant and non-dominant colors.

Claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the mapping step is for the dominant color.

Claim 6 has been amended to refer to "two of said four pixels in each block" and "the other two of said four pixels". Similarly, "said kernel coefficients" have been amended to "said kernel coefficients of each color". Following the Examiner's comments, processing means for calculating the mapped pixel values has been included in the claim.

Claim 8 has been amended to refer to "mapping each of the input space colors" instead to "mapping each of the colors".

Finally, the expression "an address" in claims 11 and 14 has been amended to "addresses".

Item 3 of the Office Action refers to the lack of a proper antecedent for the expression "said input space pixels" in claim 1. In response claim 1 has been amended to emphasize the fact that the plurality of four-pixel blocks are part of the "input space". This amendment identifies the pixels in these blocks as "input space pixels", thus providing a clear antecedent for "said input space pixels".

In response to a similar objection in Item 4, claim 6 has been amended to refer to "input space pixel values" and "output space pixel values" instead to "input space" and "output space". It is submitted that this amendment introduces a clear antecedent for "said input space pixel values".

In Items 5 and 6 of the Office Action the Examiner comments on the lack of a proper antecedent for the expression "the desired relative rotational orientation of the image" in claims 8 and 11. It is submitted that, although there is no previous mentioning of "desired relative rotational orientation of the image" in the claims, rotation of the image is well known in the art and a skilled addressee would be aware of the context of the expression. However, in deference to the Examiner's opinion, the expression has been amended to "a desired relative rotational orientation of the image".

Appin No. 09/575,122
Amndt. Dated September 15, 2004
Response to Office action of July 01, 2004

7

In light of the above amendments, which follow closely the Examiner's comments and detailed suggestions, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:


SIMON ROBERT WILLMSLEY


PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762